

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/780,256	Applicant(s) O'BANION ET AL.	
	Examiner Katherine W. Mitchell	Art Unit 3677	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Katherine W. Mitchell. (3)_____.
- (2) Jeff Urian. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 30 March 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: 4354782.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: several calls between Mr. Urian and examiner on 3/29-3/31/2006 resulted in attached examiner's amendment. When updating search, examiner noted page 2 and 3 of '782, and called to clarify the curved surface issue, since it was confusing as to what was meant by "curved toward first /inner surface" since that surface also curved. While Mr. Urian correctly explained it, examiner suggested wording that she considered clearer -- this was for clarity and not to narrow the claims - both wordings were intended to describe the curve toward the tip of the exterior surface as in Fig 15 and 16.

Since Mr. Urian has been exceptionally helpful, professional, and knowledgeable throughout the prosecution, examiner offered to let applicant add method claims back in if they included the allowable fastener structure so that an additional application would not be required; thus the new claims 110-115 are also added. .